

**Course Assessment Report
Washtenaw Community College**

Discipline	Course Number	Title
English	200	ENG 200 07/13/2023- Shakespeare
College	Division	Department
Humanities, Social and Behavioral Sciences	Humanities, Social and Behavioral Sciences	English & College Readiness
Faculty Preparer		Bill Abernethy
Date of Last Filed Assessment Report		12/11/2017

I. Review previous assessment reports submitted for this course and provide the following information.

1. Was this course previously assessed and if so, when?

Yes
September 2020

2. Briefly describe the results of previous assessment report(s).

All three outcomes were successfully met, with percentages well in excess of the minimum required.

3. Briefly describe the Action Plan/Intended Changes from the previous report(s), when and how changes were implemented.

No changes were intended. Previous reviewer considered changes to Blackboard rubric.

II. Assessment Results per Student Learning Outcome

Outcome 1: Identify major genres, themes, and techniques in selected works of Shakespeare.

- Assessment Plan
 - Assessment Tool: Formal essay
 - Assessment Date: Winter 2023
 - Course section(s)/other population: All
 - Number students to be assessed: Random sample of 50 students

- How the assessment will be scored: Departmentally-developed rubric
- Standard of success to be used for this assessment: 70% of students will score "Meets Requirements or higher."
- Who will score and analyze the data: Departmental faculty

1. Indicate the Semester(s) and year(s) assessment data were collected for this report.

Fall (indicate years below)	Winter (indicate years below)	SP/SU (indicate years below)
2021	2022, 2021	

2. Provide assessment sample size data in the table below.

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
69	30

3. If the number of students assessed differs from the number of students enrolled, please explain why all enrolled students were not assessed, e.g. absence, withdrawal, or did not complete activity.

The assessment plan calls for 20% of enrolled students; this number is exceeded with 43% assessed.

4. Describe how students from all populations (day students on campus, DL, MM, evening, extension center sites, etc.) were included in the assessment based on your selection criteria.

I chose to select from three different semesters: Fall 2021, and Winter 2021, and Winter 2022. My sample draws from online sections taught by both full- and part-time instructors.

5. Describe the process used to assess this outcome. Include a brief description of this tool and how it was scored.

The tool is a formal out-of-class essay of 750-1,000 words. It was scored using a departmentally-developed rubric:

Student Learning Outcome #1: Identify major genres, themes, and techniques in selected literary work(s).

Exceeds requirements: 2 points

Description: Essay includes two or more correct identifications of genre, theme, or technique.

Meets requirements: 1 point

Description: Essay includes at least one correct identification of genre, theme, or technique.

Does not meet requirements: 0 points

Description: Essay includes no correct identifications of genre, theme, or technique.

6. Briefly describe assessment results based on data collected for this outcome and tool during the course assessment. Discuss the extent to which students achieved this learning outcome and indicate whether the standard of success was met for this outcome and tool.

Met Standard of Success: Yes

Here are the results:

Scoring 2 points (exceeds requirements): 6 essays (20% of total)

Scoring 1 point (meets requirements): 23 essays (77% of total)

Scoring 0 points (does not meet requirements): 1 essays (3% of total)

96.6% (29/30) of the students sampled met the learning outcome requirement. The master syllabus stipulates that 70% is the standard of success, so this sample easily met it.

7. Based on your interpretation of the assessment results, describe the areas of strength in student achievement of this learning outcome.

Genres, themes, and techniques are major features of literary works and most students can readily identify them.

8. Based on your analysis of student performance, discuss the areas in which student achievement of this learning outcome could be improved. If student met standard of success, you may wish to identify your plans for continuous improvement.

I think that the instructors are doing a good job teaching this aspect of literary study.

Outcome 2: Analyze selected works of Shakespeare using appropriate literary vocabulary.

- Assessment Plan

- Assessment Tool: Formal essay
- Assessment Date: Winter 2023
- Course section(s)/other population: All
- Number students to be assessed: Random sample of 50 students
- How the assessment will be scored: Departmentally-developed rubric
- Standard of success to be used for this assessment: 70% of students will score "Meets Requirements or higher."
- Who will score and analyze the data: Departmental faculty

1. Indicate the Semester(s) and year(s) assessment data were collected for this report.

Fall (indicate years below)	Winter (indicate years below)	SP/SU (indicate years below)
2021	2022, 2021	

2. Provide assessment sample size data in the table below.

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
69	30

3. If the number of students assessed differs from the number of students enrolled, please explain why all enrolled students were not assessed, e.g. absence, withdrawal, or did not complete activity.

The assessment plan calls for 20% of enrolled students; this number is exceeded with 43% assessed.

4. Describe how students from all populations (day students on campus, DL, MM, evening, extension center sites, etc.) were included in the assessment based on your selection criteria.

I chose to select from three different semesters: Fall 2021, and Winter 2021, and Winter 2022. My sample draws from online sections taught by both full- and part-time instructors.

5. Describe the process used to assess this outcome. Include a brief description of this tool and how it was scored.

The tool is a formal out-of-class essay of 750-1,000 words. It was scored using a departmentally developed rubric:

Student Learning Outcome #2: Apply literary vocabulary to analyze selected literary work(s).

Exceeds requirements: 2 points

Description: Essay includes two or more correct applications of literary vocabulary to analyze the selected work(s).

Meets requirements: 1 point

Description: Essay includes at least one correct application of literary vocabulary to analyze the selected work(s).

Does not meet requirements: 0 points

Description: Essay includes no correct applications of literary vocabulary to analyze the selected work(s).

6. Briefly describe assessment results based on data collected for this outcome and tool during the course assessment. Discuss the extent to which students achieved this learning outcome and indicate whether the standard of success was met for this outcome and tool.

Met Standard of Success: Yes

Scoring 2 points (exceeds requirements): 4 essays (13.3% of total)

Scoring 1 point (meets requirements): 25 essays (83.3% of total)

Scoring 0 points (does not meet requirements): 1 essays (3.3% of total)

96.6% (29/30) of the students sampled met the learning outcome requirement. The master syllabus stipulates that 70% is the standard of success, so this sample met it.

7. Based on your interpretation of the assessment results, describe the areas of strength in student achievement of this learning outcome.

This assignment can be done well with fairly light use of technical terms; I'm not surprised at the high level of success.

8. Based on your analysis of student performance, discuss the areas in which student achievement of this learning outcome could be improved. If student met standard of success, you may wish to identify your plans for continuous improvement.

Instructors are doing a good job teaching this. Some will demand more use of terminology, others will emphasize engagement with the text on a thematic

basis. This flexibility should be preserved. I see no reason to change the standard of success.

Outcome 3: Evaluate selected works of Shakespeare by using the critical thinking skills of explanation and interpretation.

- Assessment Plan
 - Assessment Tool: Formal essay
 - Assessment Date: Winter 2023
 - Course section(s)/other population: All
 - Number students to be assessed: Random sample of 50 students
 - How the assessment will be scored: Departmentally-developed rubric
 - Standard of success to be used for this assessment: 70% of students will score "Meets Requirements or higher."
 - Who will score and analyze the data: Departmental faculty

1. Indicate the Semester(s) and year(s) assessment data were collected for this report.

Fall (indicate years below)	Winter (indicate years below)	SP/SU (indicate years below)
2021	2022, 2021	

2. Provide assessment sample size data in the table below.

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
69	30

3. If the number of students assessed differs from the number of students enrolled, please explain why all enrolled students were not assessed, e.g. absence, withdrawal, or did not complete activity.

The assessment plan calls for 20% of enrolled students; this number is exceeded with 43% assessed.

4. Describe how students from all populations (day students on campus, DL, MM, evening, extension center sites, etc.) were included in the assessment based on your selection criteria.

I chose to select from three different semesters: Fall 2021, and Winter 2021, and Winter 2022. My sample draws from online sections taught by both full- and part-time instructors.

5. Describe the process used to assess this outcome. Include a brief description of this tool and how it was scored.

The tool is a formal out-of-class essay of 750-1,000 words. It was scored using a departmentally developed rubric:

Student Learning Outcome #3: Apply critical thinking skills of explanation or interpretation to evaluate selected literary work(s).

Exceeds requirements: 2 points

Description: Essay does not simply retell the plot of the selected work(s) but instead includes three or more instances of explanation or interpretation to evaluate the selected work(s).

Meets requirements: 1 point

Description: Essay does not simply retell the plot of the selected work(s) but instead includes at least two instances of explanation or interpretation to evaluate the selected work(s).

Does not meet requirements: 0 points

Description: Essay simply retells the plot of the selected work(s) and/or includes fewer than two instances of explanation or interpretation to evaluate the selected work(s).

6. Briefly describe assessment results based on data collected for this outcome and tool during the course assessment. Discuss the extent to which students achieved this learning outcome and indicate whether the standard of success was met for this outcome and tool.

Met Standard of Success: Yes

Here are the results:

Scoring 2 points (exceeds requirements): 10 essays (33.3% of total)

Scoring 1 point (meets requirements): 19 essays (63.3% of total)

Scoring 0 points (does not meet requirements): 1 essays (3.3% of total)

96.6% (29/30) of the students sampled met the learning outcome requirement. The master syllabus stipulates that 70% is the standard of success, so this sample easily met it.

- Based on your interpretation of the assessment results, describe the areas of strength in student achievement of this learning outcome.

The number here is essentially the same as the last report. Critical thinking is the basis of literary criticism and it's not surprising that this is thoroughly taught in ENG 200.

- Based on your analysis of student performance, discuss the areas in which student achievement of this learning outcome could be improved. If student met standard of success, you may wish to identify your plans for continuous improvement.

This is a very high standard of success. We will continue to encourage students to develop complex interpretations of the texts.

III. Course Summary and Intended Changes Based on Assessment Results

- Based on the previous report's Intended Change(s) identified in Section I above, please discuss how effective the changes were in improving student learning.

There were no intended changes.

- Describe your overall impression of how this course is meeting the needs of students. Did the assessment process bring to light anything about student achievement of learning outcomes that surprised you?

Students who take ENG 200 tend to be excellent students due to the difficulty of the material. I believe we are meeting the needs of these highly motivated students.

- Describe when and how this information, including the action plan, was or will be shared with Departmental Faculty.

This report will be shared at an in-service department meeting.

4.

Intended Change(s)

Intended Change	Description of the change	Rationale	Implementation Date
Other: Assessment population	Changing the assessment population to 30 rather than 50.	I believe 30 students to be more than enough for assessment purposes. 50 may have been a typo.	2023

5. Is there anything that you would like to mention that was not already captured?

6.

III. Attached Files

Faculty/Preparer: Bill Abernethy **Date:** 07/17/2023
Department Chair: Carrie Krantz **Date:** 07/17/2023
Dean: Victor Vega **Date:** 07/27/2023
Assessment Committee Chair: Jessica Hale **Date:** 12/11/2023

Course Assessment Report
Washtenaw Community College

Discipline	Course Number	Title
English	200	ENG 200 09/26/2020-Shakespeare
Division	Department	Faculty Preparer
Humanities, Social and Behavioral Sciences	English & College Readiness	Thomas Zimmerman
Date of Last Filed Assessment Report		

I. Review previous assessment reports submitted for this course and provide the following information.

1. Was this course previously assessed and if so, when?

<p>Yes</p> <p>October 2017</p>

2. Briefly describe the results of previous assessment report(s).

<p>90% of the students sampled met the Learning Outcome 1 requirement: Identify major genres, themes and techniques in selected works of Shakespeare.</p> <p>93% of the students sampled met the Learning Outcome 2 requirement: Apply literary vocabulary to analyze selected works of Shakespeare.</p> <p>87% of the students sampled met the Learning Outcome 3 requirement: Apply critical thinking skills of explanation or interpretation to evaluate selected literary works.</p>
--

3. Briefly describe the Action Plan/Intended Changes from the previous report(s), when and how changes were implemented.

<p>No changes intended. However, I did write this concerning my overall impression:</p> <p>"I think the course is doing an excellent job of meeting the needs of students. I have thought this for many years, and this particular assessment process made it even clearer. The students demonstrated clear evidence of having learned the things that we want them to learn in this course. (Two quibbles: I would like to see a bit more sophistication and variety in literary vocabulary--and, of course, critical thinking by its nature presents almost infinite possibilities for improvement.)"</p>

II. Assessment Results per Student Learning Outcome

Outcome 1: Identify major genres, themes and techniques in selected works of Shakespeare.

- Assessment Plan
 - Assessment Tool: Formal essay
 - Assessment Date: Winter 2017
 - Course section(s)/other population: All
 - Number students to be assessed: Random sample of 20% of all students with a minimum of one full section
 - How the assessment will be scored: Departmentally developed rubric
 - Standard of success to be used for this assessment: 70% of students will score "Meets Requirements or higher"
 - Who will score and analyze the data: Departmental faculty

1. Indicate the Semester(s) and year(s) assessment data were collected for this report.

Fall (indicate years below)	Winter (indicate years below)	SP/SU (indicate years below)
2020, 2019		2020

2. Provide assessment sample size data in the table below.

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
83	30

3. If the number of students assessed differs from the number of students enrolled, please explain why all enrolled students were not assessed, e.g. absence, withdrawal, or did not complete activity.

ENG 200 master syllabus stipulates a random "sample of 20% of students with a minimum of one full section." The 30 students selected randomly represent one full section of the course (30 students max). Additionally, these 30 students (36% of total course enrollments) surpass the 20% required by the Master Syllabus.

4. Describe how students from all populations (day students on campus, DL, MM, evening, extension center sites, etc.) were included in the assessment based on your selection criteria.

I chose to select from three different semesters: Fall 2019, Spring/Summer 2020, and Fall 2020. My sample draws from online sections taught by both full- and part-time instructors.

5. Describe the process used to assess this outcome. Include a brief description of this tool and how it was scored.

The tool is a formal out-of-class essay of 750-1,000 words. It was scored using a departmentally-developed rubric:

Student Learning Outcome #1: Identify major genres, themes, and techniques in selected literary work(s).

Exceeds requirements: 2 points

Description: Essay includes two or more correct identifications of genre, theme, or technique.

Meets requirements: 1 point

Description: Essay includes at least one correct identification of genre, theme, or technique.

Does not meet requirements: 0 points

Description: Essay includes no correct identifications of genre, theme, or technique.

6. Briefly describe assessment results based on data collected for this outcome and tool during the course assessment. Discuss the extent to which students achieved this learning outcome and indicate whether the standard of success was met for this outcome and tool.

Met Standard of Success: Yes

Here are the results:

Scoring 2 points (exceeds requirements): 8 essays (26.7% of total)

Scoring 1 point (meets requirements): 20 essays (66.7% of total)

Scoring 0 points (does not meet requirements): 2 essays (6.7% of total)

93.4% (28/30) of the students sampled met the learning outcome requirement. The Master Syllabus stipulates that 70% is the standard of success, so this sample easily met it.

7. Based on your interpretation of the assessment results, describe the areas of strength in student achievement of this learning outcome.

Our success rate for this Student Learning Outcome (93.4%) was a shade better than that of the 2017 rate (90%).

Here's what I wrote in the 2017 report:

“Students were strong in these areas. Identification is a lower-order skill, but it is very important because it establishes the foundations of content and vocabulary in any field--in this case, literature. Most instructors of this course would start with genres, themes, and techniques early in the semester, so by the time the essays come due, most students can ‘talk the talk.’”

I could say the same now, in 2020, and add that the success rate is even more impressive if we consider the challenges that the COVID era has presented to students and instructors alike.

8. Based on your analysis of student performance, discuss the areas in which student achievement of this learning outcome could be improved. If student met standard of success, you may wish to identify your plans for continuous improvement.

I think the instructors and students are doing a great job of succeeding in this outcome. A possible improvement would be to take a wider, longer view of the outcome itself: What is the significance of being able to identify genres, themes, and techniques? Or, what larger skill are we trying to assess here?

Outcome 2: Apply literary vocabulary to analyze selected works of Shakespeare.

- Assessment Plan
 - Assessment Tool: Formal Essay
 - Assessment Date: Winter 2017
 - Course section(s)/other population: All
 - Number students to be assessed: Sample of 20% of students with a minimum of one full section
 - How the assessment will be scored: Departmentally developed rubric
 - Standard of success to be used for this assessment: 70% of students will score "Meets Requirements or higher"
 - Who will score and analyze the data: English department faculty

1. Indicate the Semester(s) and year(s) assessment data were collected for this report.

Fall (indicate years below)	Winter (indicate years below)	SP/SU (indicate years below)
2020, 2019		2020

2. Provide assessment sample size data in the table below.

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
83	30

3. If the number of students assessed differs from the number of students enrolled, please explain why all enrolled students were not assessed, e.g. absence, withdrawal, or did not complete activity.

ENG 200 master syllabus stipulates a random "sample of 20% of students with a minimum of one full section." The 30 students selected randomly represent one full section of the course (30 students max). Additionally, these 30 students (36% of total course enrollments) surpass the 20% required by the Master Syllabus.

4. Describe how students from all populations (day students on campus, DL, MM, evening, extension center sites, etc.) were included in the assessment based on your selection criteria.

I chose to select from three different semesters: Fall 2019, Spring/Summer 2020, and Fall 2020. My sample draws from online sections taught by both full- and part-time instructors.

5. Describe the process used to assess this outcome. Include a brief description of this tool and how it was scored.

The tool is a formal out-of-class essay of 750-1,000 words. It was scored using a departmentally developed rubric:

Student Learning Outcome #2: Apply literary vocabulary to analyze selected literary work(s).

Exceeds requirements: 2 points

Description: Essay includes two or more correct applications of literary vocabulary to analyze the selected work(s).

Meets requirements: 1 point

Description: Essay includes at least one correct application of literary vocabulary to analyze the selected work(s).

Does not meet requirements: 0 points

Description: Essay includes no correct applications of literary vocabulary to analyze the selected work(s).

6. Briefly describe assessment results based on data collected for this outcome and tool during the course assessment. Discuss the extent to which students achieved this learning outcome and indicate whether the standard of success was met for this outcome and tool.

Met Standard of Success: Yes

Scoring 2 points (exceeds requirements): 6 essays (20% of total)

Scoring 1 point (meets requirements): 18 essays (60% of total)

Scoring 0 points (does not meet requirements): 6 essays (20% of total)

80% (24/30) of the students sampled met the learning outcome requirement. The Master Syllabus stipulates that 70% is the standard of success, so this sample met it.

7. Based on your interpretation of the assessment results, describe the areas of strength in student achievement of this learning outcome.

Our success rate for this Student Learning Outcome (80%) was somewhat lower than the 2017 rate (93%).

Here's what I wrote in 2017:

"Students were strong in this area: 93% success rate. I believe that most teachers of this course present students with a lot of literary vocabulary early in the semester and use it daily in discussions of the reading assignments: it becomes a common language for discussing literature. As a result, by the time the essays come due, most students are fluent in this language."

Now, in 2020, I think this is still true--just a bit less so!

8. Based on your analysis of student performance, discuss the areas in which student achievement of this learning outcome could be improved. If student met standard of success, you may wish to identify your plans for continuous improvement.

Looking at this outcome in 2020, I could attribute the drop from the 2017 rate to randomness; after all, in each assessment, I looked at only 30 essays.

I could blame it on COVID!

As with Outcome #1, a possible improvement to Outcome #2 would be to take a wider, longer view of the outcome itself: What is the significance of being able to apply literary vocabulary to analyze a work? Or, what larger skill are we trying to assess here?

Outcome 3: Apply critical thinking skills of explanation or interpretation to evaluate selected literary works.

- Assessment Plan
 - Assessment Tool: Formal essay
 - Assessment Date: Winter 2017
 - Course section(s)/other population: All
 - Number students to be assessed: Sample of 20% of students with a minimum of one full section
 - How the assessment will be scored: Departmentally developed rubric
 - Standard of success to be used for this assessment: 70% of students will score "Meets Requirements or higher"
 - Who will score and analyze the data: English department faculty
1. Indicate the Semester(s) and year(s) assessment data were collected for this report.

Fall (indicate years below)	Winter (indicate years below)	SP/SU (indicate years below)
2020, 2019		2020

2. Provide assessment sample size data in the table below.

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
83	30

3. If the number of students assessed differs from the number of students enrolled, please explain why all enrolled students were not assessed, e.g. absence, withdrawal, or did not complete activity.

ENG 200 master syllabus stipulates a random "sample of 20% of students with a minimum of one full section." The 30 students selected randomly represent one

full section of the course (30 students max). Additionally, these 30 students (36% of total course enrollments) surpass the 20% required by the Master Syllabus.

4. Describe how students from all populations (day students on campus, DL, MM, evening, extension center sites, etc.) were included in the assessment based on your selection criteria.

I chose to select from three different semesters: Fall 2019, Spring/Summer 2020, and Fall 2020. My sample draws from online sections taught by both full- and part-time instructors.

5. Describe the process used to assess this outcome. Include a brief description of this tool and how it was scored.

The tool is a formal out-of-class essay of 750-1,000 words. It was scored using a departmentally developed rubric:

Student Learning Outcome #3: Apply critical thinking skills of explanation or interpretation to evaluate selected literary work(s).

Exceeds requirements: 2 points

Description: Essay does not simply retell the plot of the selected work(s) but instead includes three or more instances of explanation or interpretation to evaluate the selected work(s).

Meets requirements: 1 point

Description: Essay does not simply retell the plot of the selected work(s) but instead includes at least two instances of explanation or interpretation to evaluate the selected work(s).

Does not meet requirements: 0 points

Description: Essay simply retells the plot of the selected work(s) and/or includes fewer than two instances of explanation or interpretation to evaluate the selected work(s).

6. Briefly describe assessment results based on data collected for this outcome and tool during the course assessment. Discuss the extent to which students achieved this learning outcome and indicate whether the standard of success was met for this outcome and tool.

Met Standard of Success: Yes

Here are the results:

Scoring 2 points (exceeds requirements): 12 essays (40% of total)

Scoring 1 point (meets requirements): 18 essays (60% of total)

Scoring 0 points (does not meet requirements): 0 essays (0% of total)

100% of the students sampled met the learning outcome requirement. The Master Syllabus stipulates that 70% is the standard of success, so this sample easily met it.

7. Based on your interpretation of the assessment results, describe the areas of strength in student achievement of this learning outcome.

An astonishing 100% of the students sampled met this learning outcome requirement, a nice jump from the 87% rate in 2017.

I'm especially happy about the results of this particular outcome, which is concerned with that educational catch-all, critical thinking. I believe that critical thinking is the real thing being taught (and perhaps often learned) in every course at WCC.

Here's what I wrote in 2017:

"Students scored well in this area: 87% success rate. Almost all of them were able to quote accurately from the selected work(s) and comment critically on what they quoted. Most students did a good job of evaluating the selected work(s) as well."

8. Based on your analysis of student performance, discuss the areas in which student achievement of this learning outcome could be improved. If student met standard of success, you may wish to identify your plans for continuous improvement.

I think this is the strongest and most important of the three Student Learning Outcomes in this course. We'll try to keep up the good work.

III. Course Summary and Intended Changes Based on Assessment Results

1. Based on the previous report's Intended Change(s) identified in Section I above, please discuss how effective the changes were in improving student learning.

"No changes intended" is what I wrote in 2017.

- Describe your overall impression of how this course is meeting the needs of students. Did the assessment process bring to light anything about student achievement of learning outcomes that surprised you?

Here's what I wrote in 2017:

"I think the course is doing an excellent job of meeting the needs of students. I have thought this for many years, and this particular assessment process made it even clearer. The students demonstrated clear evidence of having learned the things that we want them to learn in this course. (Two quibbles: I would like to see a bit more sophistication and variety in literary vocabulary--and, of course, critical thinking by its nature presents almost infinite possibilities for improvement."

Now, in 2020, I would say mostly the same thing. A slightly disappointing surprise is the 80% success rate in Outcome #2 (but, as I've mentioned, it might just be random variation). A happy surprise is the 100% success rate in Outcome #3. Students in the sample displayed good critical-thinking skills in their essays.

In this course just this past semester, I started experimenting with a Blackboard essay-grading rubric, in an attempt to get close to embedded assessment. I don't think I'm quite there yet, but the rubric does have me thinking about revising the Student Learning Outcomes for the course. I'm thinking of consulting two of my departmental colleagues--Kim Jones and Hava Levitt-Phillips, who are part of the new LA Innovation committee, which is looking at reframing the liberal arts--for ideas.

- Describe when and how this information, including the action plan, was or will be shared with Departmental Faculty.

I'll share this with the Department at our next Department meeting.

- Intended Change(s)

Intended Change	Description of the change	Rationale	Implementation Date
Outcome Language	I'm thinking of revising the Student Learning Outcomes, especially #1 and #2.	The reason: The Blackboard essay-grading rubric I've started to use has me rethinking what the Student Learning Outcomes should be. Also, I'm interested in what	2021

		my colleagues in the new LA Innovation committee might have to say.	
--	--	---	--

5. Is there anything that you would like to mention that was not already captured?

6.

III. Attached Files

[ENG 200 Assessment Data Dec2020](#)

Faculty/Preparer: Thomas Zimmerman **Date:** 12/31/2020
Department Chair: Carrie Krantz **Date:** 01/07/2021
Dean: Scott Britten **Date:** 01/08/2021
Assessment Committee Chair: Shawn Deron **Date:** 02/27/2021

Course Assessment Report
Washtenaw Community College

Discipline	Course Number	Title
English	200	ENG 200 10/03/2017- Shakespeare
Division	Department	Faculty Preparer
Humanities, Social and Behavioral Sciences	English/Writing	Thomas Zimmerman
Date of Last Filed Assessment Report		

I. Assessment Results per Student Learning Outcome

Outcome 1: Identify major genres, themes and techniques in selected works of Shakespeare.

- Assessment Plan
 - Assessment Tool: Formal essay
 - Assessment Date: Winter 2017
 - Course section(s)/other population: All
 - Number students to be assessed: Random sample of 20% of all students with a minimum of one full section
 - How the assessment will be scored: Departmentally developed rubric
 - Standard of success to be used for this assessment: 70% of students will score "Meets Requirements or higher"
 - Who will score and analyze the data: Departmental faculty

1. Indicate the Semester(s) and year(s) assessment data were collected for this report.

Fall (indicate years below)	Winter (indicate years below)	SP/SU (indicate years below)
2016	2017	2017

2. Provide assessment sample size data in the table below.

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
91	30

3. If the number of students assessed differs from the number of students enrolled, please explain why all enrolled students were not assessed, e.g. absence, withdrawal, or did not complete activity.

The ENG 200 master syllabus stipulates a random "sample of 20% of students with a minimum of one full section." The 30 students selected randomly represent one full section of the course (30 students max). Additionally, these 30 students (27.5% of total course enrollments) surpass the 20% required by the master syllabus.

4. Describe how students from all populations (day students on campus, DL, MM, evening, extension center sites, etc.) were included in the assessment based on your selection criteria.

I chose to select from three different semesters (Winter, Summer, and Fall 2016) because usually only one section of the course is offered each semester. This sampling also allowed me to include both face-to-face and online sections. In addition, my sample draws from sections taught by both full- and part-time instructors.

5. Describe the process used to assess this outcome. Include a brief description of this tool and how it was scored.

The tool is a formal out-of-class essay of 750-1,000 words. It was scored using a departmentally-developed rubric:

Student Learning Outcome #1: Identify major genres, themes, and techniques in selected literary work(s).

Exceeds requirements: 2 points
Description: Essay includes more than four correct identifications of genre, theme, or technique.

Meets requirements: 1 point
Description: Essay includes four correct identification of genre, theme, or technique.

Does not meet requirements: 0 points
Description: Essay includes fewer than four correct identifications of genre, theme, or technique.

6. Briefly describe assessment results based on data collected for this outcome and tool during the course assessment. Discuss the extent to which students achieved this

learning outcome and indicate whether the standard of success was met for this outcome and tool.

Met Standard of Success: <u>Yes</u>
Here are the results: Scoring 2 points (exceeds requirements): 6 essays (20% of total) Scoring 1 point (meets requirements): 21 essays (70% of total) Scoring 0 points (does not meet requirements): 3 essays (10% of total) 90% of the students sampled met the learning outcome requirement. The master syllabus stipulates that 70% is the standard of success, so this sample easily met it.

7. Based on your interpretation of the assessment results, describe the areas of strength in student achievement of this learning outcome.

Students were strong in these areas. Identification is a lower-order skill, but it is very important because it establishes the foundations of content and vocabulary in any field--in this case, literature. Most instructors of this course would start with genres, themes, and techniques early in the semester, so by the time the essays come due, most students can "talk the talk."

8. Based on your analysis of student performance, discuss the areas in which student achievement of this learning outcome could be improved. If student met standard of success, you may wish to identify your plans for continuous improvement.

Our success rate in this learning outcome was 90%, so there's not a lot of room for improvement. I think it's fair to assume that ENG 200: Shakespeare, since it is an elective that requires difficult reading and a lot of writing, is a course that low-skilled or uninterested students would avoid registering for.

Outcome 2: Apply literary vocabulary to analyze selected works of Shakespeare.

- Assessment Plan

- Assessment Tool: Formal Essay
- Assessment Date: Winter 2017
- Course section(s)/other population: All
- Number students to be assessed: Sample of 20% of students with a minimum of one full section
- How the assessment will be scored: Departmentally developed rubric
- Standard of success to be used for this assessment: 70% of students will score "Meets Requirements or higher"
- Who will score and analyze the data: English department faculty

1. Indicate the Semester(s) and year(s) assessment data were collected for this report.

Fall (indicate years below)	Winter (indicate years below)	SP/SU (indicate years below)
2016	2017	2017

2. Provide assessment sample size data in the table below.

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
91	30

3. If the number of students assessed differs from the number of students enrolled, please explain why all enrolled students were not assessed, e.g. absence, withdrawal, or did not complete activity.

The ENG 200 master syllabus stipulates a random "sample of 20% of students with a minimum of one full section." The 30 students selected randomly represent one full section of the course (30 students max). Additionally, these 30 students (27.5% of total course enrollments) surpass the 20% required by the master syllabus.

4. Describe how students from all populations (day students on campus, DL, MM, evening, extension center sites, etc.) were included in the assessment based on your selection criteria.

I chose to select from three different semesters (Winter, Summer, and Fall 2016) because usually only one section of the course is offered each semester. This sampling also allowed me to include both face-to-face and online sections. In addition, my sample draws from sections taught by both full- and part-time instructors.

5. Describe the process used to assess this outcome. Include a brief description of this tool and how it was scored.

The tool is a formal out-of-class essay of 750-1,000 words. It was scored using a departmentally-developed rubric:
Student Learning Outcome #2: Apply literary vocabulary to analyze selected literary work(s).
Exceeds requirements: 2 points
Description: Essay includes more than four correct applications of literary vocabulary to analyze the selected work(s).
Meets requirements: 1 points
Description: Essay includes four correct applications of literary vocabulary to analyze the selected work(s).
Does not meet requirements: 0 points
Description: Essay includes fewer than four correct applications of literary vocabulary to analyze the selected work(s).

6. Briefly describe assessment results based on data collected for this outcome and tool during the course assessment. Discuss the extent to which students achieved this learning outcome and indicate whether the standard of success was met for this outcome and tool.

Met Standard of Success: Yes

Here are the results:

Scoring 2 points (exceeds requirements): 7 essays (23% of total)

Scoring 1 point (meets requirements): 21 essays (70% of total)

Scoring 0 points (does not meet requirements): 2 essays (7% of total)

93% of the students sampled met the learning outcome requirement. The Master Syllabus stipulates that 70% is the standard of success, so this sample easily met it.

7. Based on your interpretation of the assessment results, describe the areas of strength in student achievement of this learning outcome.

Students were strong in this area: 93% success rate. I believe that most teachers of this course present students with a lot of literary vocabulary

early in the semester and use it daily in discussions of the reading assignments: it becomes a common language for discussing literature. As a result, by the time the essays come due, most students are fluent in this language.

8. Based on your analysis of student performance, discuss the areas in which student achievement of this learning outcome could be improved. If student met standard of success, you may wish to identify your plans for continuous improvement.

The students scored well in this area, but I would like to see a bit more academic sophistication in use of literary vocabulary. Most of the students used basic vocabulary; it would like to see a bit more variety and sophistication. I think more teacher modeling of literary vocabulary would help.

Outcome 3: Apply critical thinking skills of explanation or interpretation to evaluate selected literary works.

- Assessment Plan
 - Assessment Tool: Formal essay
 - Assessment Date: Winter 2017
 - Course section(s)/other population: All
 - Number students to be assessed: Sample of 20% of students with a minimum of one full section
 - How the assessment will be scored: Departmentally developed rubric
 - Standard of success to be used for this assessment: 70% of students will score "Meets Requirements or higher"
 - Who will score and analyze the data: English department faculty

1. Indicate the Semester(s) and year(s) assessment data were collected for this report.

Fall (indicate years below)	Winter (indicate years below)	SP/SU (indicate years below)
2016	2017	2017

2. Provide assessment sample size data in the table below.

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
------------------------	------------------------

3. If the number of students assessed differs from the number of students enrolled, please explain why all enrolled students were not assessed, e.g. absence, withdrawal, or did not complete activity.

The ENG 200 master syllabus stipulates a random "sample of 20% of students with a minimum of one full section." The 30 students selected randomly represent one full section of the course (30 students max). Additionally, these 30 students (27.5% of total course enrollments) surpass the 20% required by the master syllabus.

4. Describe how students from all populations (day students on campus, DL, MM, evening, extension center sites, etc.) were included in the assessment based on your selection criteria.

I chose to select from three different semesters (Winter, Summer, and Fall 2016) because usually only one section of the course is offered each semester. This sampling also allowed me to include both face-to-face and online sections. In addition, my sample draws from sections taught by both full- and part-time instructors.

5. Describe the process used to assess this outcome. Include a brief description of this tool and how it was scored.

The tool is a formal out-of-class essay of 750-1,000 words. It was scored using a departmentally-developed rubric:

Student Learning Outcome #3: Apply critical thinking skills of explanation or interpretation to evaluate selected literary work(s).

Exceeds requirements: 2 points
Description: Essay does not simply retell the plot of the selected work(s) but instead includes more than four instances of explanation or interpretation to evaluate the selected work(s).

Meets requirements: 1 point
Description: Essay does not simply retell the plot of the selected work(s) but instead includes four instances of explanation or interpretation to evaluate the selected work(s).

Does not meet requirements: 0 points

Description: Essay simply retells the plot of the selected work(s) and/or includes fewer than four instances of explanation or interpretation to evaluate the selected work(s).

6. Briefly describe assessment results based on data collected for this outcome and tool during the course assessment. Discuss the extent to which students achieved this learning outcome and indicate whether the standard of success was met for this outcome and tool.

Met Standard of Success: Yes

Here are the results:

Scoring 2 points (exceeds requirements): 8 essays (27%)

Scoring 1 point (meets requirements): 18 essays (60%)

Scoring 0 points (does not meet requirements): 4 essays (13%)

87% of the students sampled met the learning outcome requirement. The Master Syllabus stipulates that 70% is the standard of success, so this sample easily met it.

7. Based on your interpretation of the assessment results, describe the areas of strength in student achievement of this learning outcome.

Students scored well in this area: 87% success rate. Almost all of them were able to quote accurately from the selected work(s) and comment critically on what they quoted. Most students did a good job of evaluating the selected work(s) as well.

8. Based on your analysis of student performance, discuss the areas in which student achievement of this learning outcome could be improved. If student met standard of success, you may wish to identify your plans for continuous improvement.

The typical weakness in this area is students' tendency to do too much recounting of the plot (in other words, simply retelling the story) rather than analyzing and evaluating a theme or technique. This is higher-order thinking, of course. I think we as teachers might need to do more modeling of what a literary essay does.

II. Course Summary and Action Plans Based on Assessment Results

1. Describe your overall impression of how this course is meeting the needs of students. Did the assessment process bring to light anything about student achievement of learning outcomes that surprised you?

I think the course is doing an excellent job of meeting the needs of students. I have thought this for many years, and this particular assessment process made it even clearer. The students demonstrated clear evidence of having learned the things that we want them to learn in this course. (Two quibbles: I would like to see a bit more sophistication and variety in literary vocabulary--and, of course, critical thinking by its nature presents almost infinite possibilities for improvement.)

2. Describe when and how this information, including the action plan, was or will be shared with Departmental Faculty.

I will share this information with departmental faculty at the next department meeting.

3. Intended Change(s)

Intended Change	Description of the change	Rationale	Implementation Date
No changes intended.			

4. Is there anything that you would like to mention that was not already captured?

5.

III. Attached Files

[ENG 200 Assessment Report](#)

Faculty/Preparer: Thomas Zimmerman **Date:** 10/06/2017
Department Chair: Carrie Krantz **Date:** 10/11/2017
Dean: Kristin Good **Date:** 10/11/2017
Assessment Committee Chair: Michelle Garey **Date:** 11/28/2017

**Course Assessment Report
Washtenaw Community College**

Discipline	Course Number	Title
English	200	ENG 200 04/10/2014- Shakespeare
Division	Department	Faculty Preparer
Humanities, Social and Behavioral Sciences	English/Writing	Carrie Krantz
Date of Last Filed Assessment Report		

I. Assessment Results per Student Learning Outcome

Outcome 1: Read works by William Shakespeare and identify major themes, elements and techniques in these works

- Assessment Plan
 - Assessment Tool: Once in each 3-year cycle, the department will evaluate a formal, analytical, literary essay based on selected course readings.
 - Assessment Date: Winter 2009
 - Course section(s)/other population: all
 - Number students to be assessed: sample of 20%
 - How the assessment will be scored:
 - Standard of success to be used for this assessment:
 - Who will score and analyze the data:

1. Indicate the Semester(s) and year(s) assessment data were collected for this report.

Fall (indicate years below)	Winter (indicate years below)	SP/SU (indicate years below)
2013, 2012	2012, 2013	

2. Provide assessment sample size data in the table below.

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
149	62

3. If the number of students assessed differs from the number of students enrolled, please explain why all enrolled students were not assessed, e.g. absence, withdrawal,

or did not complete activity.

Because we offer so few sections of ENG 200, we collected sample essays over the course of two years, Fall 2012-midterm 2014.

4. Describe how students from all populations (day students on campus, DL, MM, evening, extension center sites, etc.) were included in the assessment based on your selection criteria.

The sample included both DL and face-to-face sections. We have not offered ENG 200 in the MM form, and we do not offer the course at extension sites.

5. Describe the process used to assess this outcome. Include a brief description of this tool and how it was scored.

The department created an 8 point rubric for assessing literary analysis essays. Students needed to score at a C grade or better in at least 6 of the categories to be considered passing.

6. Briefly describe assessment results based on data collected for this outcome and tool during the course assessment. Discuss the extent to which students achieved this learning outcome and indicate whether the standard of success was met for this outcome and tool.

Met Standard of Success: Yes

Of the 62 essays collected and read, 54 students met the standard for passing, and 8 students did not. In general, the essays that did not pass failed to demonstrate the ability to analyze the literature beyond mere summarization. These essays also tended to be weak in the use of standard written English. The essays clearly demonstrated that the students read and engaged with the literature, and the passing essays students were able to identify appropriate literary themes for the works and apply the correct literary terminology to discuss the themes.

7. Based on your interpretation of the assessment results, describe the areas of strength in student achievement of this learning outcome.

All of the essays clearly demonstrated that the students read and engaged with the literature, and in the passing essays, students were able to identify appropriate literary themes for the works and apply the correct literary terminology to discuss the themes.

8. Based on your analysis of student performance, discuss the areas in which student achievement of this learning outcome could be improved. If student met standard of success, you may wish to identify your plans for continuous improvement.

The students were successful in reading the assigned Shakespearian works, which is due to the reading quizzes they had to take. The majority of the students were

able to meaningfully identify themes and apply appropriate literary terminology to analyze those themes.

Outcome 2: Use literary vocabulary to analyze Shakespearean literature in an academic essay.

- Assessment Plan
 - Assessment Tool: Once in each 3-year cycle, the department will evaluate a formal, analytical, literary essay based on selected course readings.
 - Assessment Date: Winter 2009
 - Course section(s)/other population: all
 - Number students to be assessed: sample of 20%
 - How the assessment will be scored:
 - Standard of success to be used for this assessment:
 - Who will score and analyze the data:

1. Indicate the Semester(s) and year(s) assessment data were collected for this report.

Fall (indicate years below)	Winter (indicate years below)	SP/SU (indicate years below)
2013, 2012	2012	

2. Provide assessment sample size data in the table below.

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
105	62

3. If the number of students assessed differs from the number of students enrolled, please explain why all enrolled students were not assessed, e.g. absence, withdrawal, or did not complete activity.

Because we offer so few sections of ENG 200, we collected essays over the course of two years, Fall 2012-midterm 2014.

4. Describe how students from all populations (day students on campus, DL, MM, evening, extension center sites, etc.) were included in the assessment based on your selection criteria.

The sample included both DL and face-to-face sections. We have not offered ENG 200 in the MM form, and we do not offer it at extension sites.

5. Describe the process used to assess this outcome. Include a brief description of this tool and how it was scored.

The department created an 8 point rubric for assessing literary analysis essays. Students needed to score at a C or better in at least 6 of the categories to be considered passing.

6. Briefly describe assessment results based on data collected for this outcome and tool during the course assessment. Discuss the extent to which students achieved this learning outcome and indicate whether the standard of success was met for this outcome and tool.

Met Standard of Success: Yes

Of the 62 essays collected and read, 54 students met the standard for passing, and 8 students did not. In general, the essays that did not pass failed to demonstrate the ability to analyze the literature beyond mere summarization. These essays also tended to be weak in the use of standard written English. In the passing essays, students were able to identify appropriate literary themes for the works and apply the correct literary terminology to discuss the themes.

7. Based on your interpretation of the assessment results, describe the areas of strength in student achievement of this learning outcome.

Of the 62 essays collected and read, 54 students met the standard for passing, and 8 students did not. The essays that did not pass failed to demonstrate the ability to analyze the literature beyond mere summarization. These essays also tended to be weak in the use of standard written English. In the passing essays, students were able to identify appropriate literary terms for discussing the works of Shakespeare and apply the correct literary terminology.

8. Based on your analysis of student performance, discuss the areas in which student achievement of this learning outcome could be improved. If student met standard of success, you may wish to identify your plans for continuous improvement.

The students met the standard of success for this outcome. The department will stay the course for this outcome for continued success.

Outcome 3: Apply critical thinking skills of observation, explanation and interpretation to evaluate Shakespearean literature.

- Assessment Plan
 - Assessment Tool: Once in each 3-year cycle, the department will evaluate a formal, analytical, literary essay based on selected course readings.

- Assessment Date: Winter 2009
- Course section(s)/other population: all
- Number students to be assessed: sample of 20%
- How the assessment will be scored:
- Standard of success to be used for this assessment:
- Who will score and analyze the data:

1. Indicate the Semester(s) and year(s) assessment data were collected for this report.

Fall (indicate years below)	Winter (indicate years below)	SP/SU (indicate years below)
2013, 2012	2012, 2013	

2. Provide assessment sample size data in the table below.

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
149	62

3. If the number of students assessed differs from the number of students enrolled, please explain why all enrolled students were not assessed, e.g. absence, withdrawal, or did not complete activity.

Because we offer so few sections of ENG 200, we collected sample essays over the course of two years, Fall 2012-Midterm 2014.

4. Describe how students from all populations (day students on campus, DL, MM, evening, extension center sites, etc.) were included in the assessment based on your selection criteria.

The sample included both DL and face-to-face sections. We have not offered ENG 200 in the MM form, and we do not offer the course at extension sites.

5. Describe the process used to assess this outcome. Include a brief description of this tool and how it was scored.

The department created an 8 point rubric for assessing literary analysis essays. Students needed to score at a C or better in at least 6 of the categories to be considered passing.

6. Briefly describe assessment results based on data collected for this outcome and tool during the course assessment. Discuss the extent to which students achieved this learning outcome and indicate whether the standard of success was met for this outcome and tool.

Met Standard of Success: Yes

Of the 62 essays collected and read, 54 students met the standard for passing, and 8 students did not. In general, the essays that did not pass failed to demonstrate the ability to analyze the literature beyond mere summarization. These essays also tended to be weak in the use of standard written English. In the passing essays, students cited relevant passages from the texts to support their thesis and used the passages to critically analyze the constructs of Shakespeare's plays.

7. Based on your interpretation of the assessment results, describe the areas of strength in student achievement of this learning outcome.

Of the 62 essays collected and read, 54 students met the standard for passing, and 8 students did not. In general, the essays that did not pass failed to demonstrate the ability to analyze the literature beyond mere summarization. These essays also tended to be weak in the use of standard written English. In the passing essays, students cited relevant passages from the texts to support their thesis and used the passages to critically analyze the constructs of Shakespeare's plays.

8. Based on your analysis of student performance, discuss the areas in which student achievement of this learning outcome could be improved. If student met standard of success, you may wish to identify your plans for continuous improvement.

We met the standard for success for this outcome and will stay the course with the curriculum for continued success.

II. Course Summary and Action Plans Based on Assessment Results

1. Describe your overall impression of how this course is meeting the needs of students. Did the assessment process bring to light anything about student achievement of learning outcomes that surprised you?

This course is meeting student needs for an introductory course on the works of Shakespeare. Although the standards for success were met, we observed that the literary analysis essays that were submitted by instructors with exhaustive instructions for the completion of the assignment tended to be stronger essays.

2. Describe when and how this information, including the action plan, was or will be shared with Departmental Faculty.

This report will be shared with the full-time instructors in the department and with future part-time instructors who are teaching the class.

3. Intended Change(s)

Intended Change	Description of the change	Rationale	Implementation Date
No changes intended.			

4. Is there anything that you would like to mention that was not already captured?
-

III. Attached Files

[Literary Analysis Rubric](#)

Faculty/Preparer:	Carrie Krantz	Date: 04/10/2014
Department Chair:	Carrie Krantz	Date: 04/14/2014
Dean:	Dena Blair	Date: 04/14/2014
Assessment Committee Chair:	Michelle Garey	Date: 04/28/2014

COURSE ASSESSMENT REPORT

I. Background Information

1. Course assessed:

Course Discipline Code and Number: ENG 200
 Course Title: Shakespeare
 Division/Department Codes: HSS

2. Semester assessment was conducted (check one):

- Fall 2006__
- Winter 20__
- Spring/Summer 20__

3. Assessment tool(s) used: check all that apply.

- Portfolio
- Standardized test
- Other external certification/licensure exam (specify):
- Survey
- Prompt
- Departmental exam
- Capstone experience (specify):
- Other (specify): Quiz

4. Have these tools been used before?

- Yes
- No

If yes, have the tools been altered since its last administration? If so, briefly describe changes made.
 No.

5. Indicate the number of students assessed/total number of students enrolled in the course.
 20/22

6. Describe how students were selected for the assessment.
 All twenty students attending the class took the quiz. (Two students had stopped attending.) Of the 20 quizzes collected, 5 quizzes were randomly selected to be assessed.

II. Results

1. Briefly describe the changes that were implemented in the course as a result of the previous assessment.
 This is the first assessment round under the new system.

2. State each outcome (verbatim) from the master syllabus for the course that was assessed.
 "Students will read works by William Shakespeare."

3. Briefly describe assessment results based on data collected during the course assessment, demonstrating the extent to which students are achieving each of the learning outcomes listed above. *Please attach a summary of the data collected.*
 Four of the five students passed with a "C" or higher. Only one student did not have a good grasp of the Shakespeare play and the literary elements we had studied. 100% of the attending students took the quiz, which is a success.

4. For each outcome assessed, indicate the standard of success used, and the percentage of students who achieved that level of success. *Please attach the rubric/scoring guide used for the assessment.*
 70% of the students assessed will achieve a score of 75% or better. (See scoring rubric attached.)

5. Describe the areas of strength and weakness in students' achievement of the learning outcomes shown in assessment results.
 Strengths: 80% had clearly read the play and wrote confidently about plot and characters.

COURSE ASSESSMENT REPORT

Weaknesses: The answers related to theme were not as strong as the rest of the quiz. Theme is a challenging concept for many students.

III. Changes influenced by assessment results

1. If weaknesses were found (see above) or students did not meet expectations, describe the action that will be taken to address these weaknesses.

More instruction needs to be focused on identifying and exploring both major and minor themes.

2. Identify intended changes that will be instituted based on results of this assessment activity (check all that apply). Please describe changes and give rationale for change.

a. [] Outcomes/Assessments on the Master Syllabus

Change/rationale:

b. [] Objectives/Evaluation on the Master Syllabus

Change/rationale:

c. [] Course pre-requisites on the Master Syllabus

Change/rationale:

d. [] 1st Day Handouts

Change/rationale:

e. [] Course assignments

Change/rationale:

f. [] Course materials (check all that apply)

[] Textbook

[] Handouts

[] Other:

g. [x] Instructional methods

Change/rationale: We will devote more time to defining and identifying themes in the plays. A more thorough presentation of this concept will hopefully deepen the students' understanding.

h. [x] Individual lessons & activities

Change/rationale: We will practice making lists of possible themes, then discarding ones that are mere subjects and keeping the ones that are truly themes. Next, we will elaborate, through discussion and writing, on those themes.

3. What is the timeline for implementing these actions? Begin change in Winter '07.

IV. Future plans

1. Describe the extent to which the assessment tools used were effective in measuring student achievement of learning outcomes for this course.

Effective.

2. If the assessment tools were not effective, describe the changes that will be made for future assessments.

3. Which outcomes from the master syllabus have been addressed in this report?

All _____ Selected [x]

If "All", provide the report date for the next full review: _____.

If "Selected", provide the report date for remaining outcomes: Fall 07

COURSE ASSESSMENT REPORT

Submitted by:

Name: DEBORAH BAYER / Deborah Bayer Date: 1/3/07
Print/Signature
Department Chair: CHARLES AVINGER / Charles Avinger Date: 1/3/07
Print/Signature
Dean: [Signature] Date: JAN 05 2007
Print/Signature